



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/908,265 08/07/97 AUCLAIR

D HARI026US2

020227 LM02/0120
MAJESTIC PARSONS SIEBERT & HSUE
SUITE 1100
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-4106

EXAMINER

MOISE, F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2784

DATE MAILED:

01/20/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/908,265

Applicant(s)

Auclair et al.

Examiner
Emmanuel L. Moise

Group Art Unit
2784



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on July 17 and Aug 8, 1998

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1035 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 7

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2784

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-44 are presented for examination.

Double Patenting

2. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

3. Claims 35-37 and 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 37-39, 43, 20, 23, and 26-27, respectively, of prior U.S. Patent No. 5,652,720.

This is a double patenting rejection.

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Examination
4-13-00 while
reopening 09/03/00
028
Double Patenting / Unproper rejection
should have been
a suggestion of the claims for
interference

Art Unit: 2784

5. Claims 38 and 39 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 41 and 42 of U. S. Patent No. 5,652,720 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: A memory device comprising: a group of memory cells arranged in a row that includes a first cell; and means for determining that includes means for determining the likelihood by applying each of the plurality of read voltages whenever a write (claim 38 of the present application and claim 41 of patent no. 5,652,720) or a read (claim 39 of the present application and claim 42 of patent no. 5,652,720) is performed on any cell of the group of memory cells (claims 38-39 of the present application) or on the group of memory cells (claims 41-42 of patent no. 5,652,720).

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

6. Claims 1-14, 29-31, and 15-28, 32-34 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-3, 7-11, and 4-6, respectively, of U. S. Patent No. 5,657,332 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

Art Unit: 2784

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: A solid-state memory system or method capable of recovering from read errors

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

5,070,032 (Yuan et al.)

5,172,338 (Mehrotra et al.)

5,200,959 (Gross et al.)

5,270,979 (Harari et al.)

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emmanuel L. Moise whose telephone number is (703)305-9763. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 08:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady, can be reached on (703)305-9595. Any response to this action

Art Unit: 2784

should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231, or
faxed to: (703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry), Or: (703) 305-3718
(for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist). The facsimile phone number for this group is
(703) 308-5357.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be
directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


Emmanuel L. Moise
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2784

January 13, 2000